



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,884	03/13/2001	RAJA SINGH TULI		7676

7590 02/27/2004
James C. Scheller, Jr.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

JONES, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

8

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,884

Applicant(s)

TULI, RAJA SINGH

Examiner

David L Jones

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/06/2003 was filed after the mailing date of the First Action on the Merits on 8/06/2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

3. The amendment filed on 11/15/03 cancels claims 1 and 2. The Amendment has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-32 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloan (US 5,928,324) and further in view of Rosen et al. (US 5,995,102).

Regarding claim 3, Sloan teaches a method whereby Internet content can be viewed consisting of :

displaying in a first portion of a display (fig. 3, #240, column 4, lines 27-53) of a device a user interface image including a web browser for web browsing (column 5, lines 7-28);

sending a request for a web page from the device to a remote server (fig. 5, #360, column 6, lines 51-66);

receiving at the device from the remote server in a compressed format a web page image (fig. 9, #500, column 8, lines 2-31) the web page image being rendered at the remote server from the entire web page which the remote server retrieves from the Internet in response to a request,

Art Unit: 2622

and under control of the device (column 8, lines 57-67, and column 9, lines 1-23), selectively displaying a portion of the web page image in a second portion of the display of the device according to a user input to the device while the user interface image is displayed in the first portion of the display.

Sloan does not explicitly detail a web page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45.

Further, Sloan does not explicitly detail exclusive control of a web page image, but does teach in column 9, lines 1-23, that the client has means for storing application code (fig. 2, #100) and a means (#110) for executing application code to generate output requests, and a means (#120) for communicating the output requests to the server, the terminal having a display screen (fig. 6, #440) and means (#370) for issuing the remote request to the server; the output requests comprising display requests directed to manipulating the display screen and non-display requests which can be processed independently of the terminal or client. And as shown in column 8, lines 2-31, that an image of a web page is generated separate of a web page and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that from the previous information the image can be displayed in a separate display window with its own browsing capabilities as shown by Rosen.

Sloan and Rosen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is how a web page is to be displayed with respect to a server.

At the time the invention of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Sloan web page with the Rosen web page.

Art Unit: 2622

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to browse within a web page window, which would include buttons for browsing the Internet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan with Rosen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Regarding claim 4, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches that the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image.

Regarding claim 5, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches that the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image. And Sloan further, details that the client sends requests for screen geometry (column 5, lines 29-53) or a particular location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that Sloan would include the ability to scroll the web page image as taught by Rosen.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image web page to that of the underlying larger web page image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan with Rosen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches that the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that the larger window position is fixed as shown in fig. 6, and the smaller window is allowed to be scrolled.

Regarding claim 7, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. Sloan does not explicitly teach receiving a click on a page and the location of the click being detailed back at the server, but does teach that the client sends requests for screen geometry (column 5, lines 29-53) or a particular location.

Whereas, Rosen teaches in column 3, lines 16-35, that a cursor controlled by a positioning device which a user uses to navigate the cursor over objects, buttons, menus, scroll bars, etc., which appear on screen and then clicking or in some cases double-clicking in order to activate a screen or task, or to commence an application or some function.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that when a user would click as taught by Rosen within a window, and as taught by Sloan that the application code would send back the information of the location to the server, so that the server would be able to update the data in the open window.

Regarding claim 8, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. Sloan does not explicitly detail a web

Art Unit: 2622

page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45, of which includes buttons: back, forward, stop, home, refresh, search, enter or go.

7. Claims 9-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloan and Rosen et al. as applied to claims 3-8 above, and further in view of Deo et al. (US 6,282,294).

Regarding claim 9, Sloan and Rosen teach a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But do not explicitly disclose that there is an image icon that when activated causes a display of a keyboard to be displayed on the display.

Whereas, Deo et al. teaches (column 1, lines 33-42, that the keyboard can be integrated within the display, such as a touch sensitive display. And further, that the display of figure 4, #42, has a hand writing area where a user can input hand written messages, they are stored in memory, and can be recalled by the user and displayed on screen. Further, the device has an alphanumeric character recognition module that when a user writes with the stylus, and character recognition software converts the characters into computer recognizable characters, which can be used by the application programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that with the ability to recognize hand written characters that it would have been obvious that a icon can be activated and it would bring up a keyboard, thereby allowing the user to input data which would use less computing power than hand written characters.

Art Unit: 2622

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the keyboard display of Deo with the web page of Sloan and Rosen.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a keyboard icon, which when activated would allow a user a communication interface to input information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan and Rosen with Deo to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Sloan, Rosen and Deo all detail the ability to interface with a web page. Sloan and Deo do not explicitly detail each component of a web page, Deo teaches that the hand held device can subscribe to a wireless carrier and have access to the Internet utilizing a Internet Explorer product (column 4, lines 4-17); and can access a server and the internet through a WAN or LAN as taught in column 9, lines 19-35.

However, Rosen teaches in figure 8, a web page that includes an input area for entering a web address (#60A). Although, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that a web browser such as Internet Explorer includes an address bar.

Regarding claim 11, Sloan, Rosen and Deo teach that the web page application is resident in the device or client terminal. Sloan teaches in column 6, lines 51-66, that the web browser code is stored in the remote user terminal, and Rosen in column 4, lines 4-24, that a terminal includes a processor, operating system, a display, and a HTTP compliant web browser. Deo teaches that the hand held device can subscribe to a wireless carrier and have access to the Internet utilizing a Internet Explorer product (column 4, lines 4-17); and can access a server and the internet through a WAN or LAN as taught in column 9, lines 19-35.

Regarding claim 12, Sloan teaches upon initialization of the HTML page initially downloaded into the remote user terminal from the server comprises decoder code executable by the CPU of the remote user terminal to decode and execute display related x requests forwarded from the server (column 7, lines 8-33). Rosen does not explicitly detail interface image upon initialization. Deo however, teaches that the device includes synchronization, which allows the device to synchronize data between a desktop computer or another wireless device (column 4, lines 55-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that upon initialization of the web browser on the device that the server would generate a new web page image.

Regarding claim 13, Sloan teaches a method whereby Internet content can be viewed consisting of :

means for displaying in a first portion of a display (fig. 3, #240, column 4, lines 27-53) of a device a user interface image including a web browser for web browsing (column 5, lines 7-28);

means for sending a request for a web page from the device to a remote server (fig. 5, #360, column 5, lines 7-28);

means for receiving at the device from the remote server in a compressed format a web page image (fig. 9, #500, column 8, lines 2-31) the web page image being rendered at the remote server from the entire web page which the remote server retrieves from the Internet in response to a request,

and under control of the device (fig. 6, #370, column 8, lines 57-67, and column 9, lines 1-23), means for selectively displaying a portion of the web page image in a second portion of

Art Unit: 2622

the display of the device according to a user input to the device while the user interface image is displayed in the first portion of the display.

Sloan does not explicitly detail a web page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45.

Further, Sloan does not explicitly detail exclusive control of a web page image, but does teach in column 9, lines 1-23, that the client has means for storing application code (fig. 2, #100) and a means (#110) for executing application code to generate output requests, and a means (#120) for communicating the output requests to the server, the terminal having a display screen (fig. 6, #440) and means (#370) for issuing the remote request to the server; the output requests comprising display requests directed to manipulating the display screen and non-display requests which can be processed independently of the terminal or client. And as shown in column 8, lines 2-31, that an image of a web page is generated separate of a web page and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that from the previous information the image can be displayed in a separate display window with its own browsing capabilities as shown by Rosen.

Sloan and Rosen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is how a web page is to be displayed with respect to a server.

At the time the invention of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Sloan web page with the Rosen web page.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to browse within a web page window, which would include buttons for browsing the Internet.

Art Unit: 2622

the display of the device according to a user input to the device while the user interface image is displayed in the first portion of the display.

Sloan does not explicitly detail a web page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45.

Further, Sloan does not explicitly detail exclusive control of a web page image, but does teach in column 9, lines 1-23, that the client has means for storing application code (fig. 2, #100) and a means (#110) for executing application code to generate output requests, and a means (#120) for communicating the output requests to the server, the terminal having a display screen (fig. 6, #440) and means (#370) for issuing the remote request to the server; the output requests comprising display requests directed to manipulating the display screen and non-display requests which can be processed independently of the terminal or client. And as shown in column 8, lines 2-31, that an image of a web page is generated separate of a web page and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that from the previous information the image can be displayed in a separate display window with its own browsing capabilities as shown by Rosen.

Sloan and Rosen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is how a web page is to be displayed with respect to a server.

At the time the invention of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Sloan web page with the Rosen web page.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to browse within a web page window, which would include buttons for browsing the Internet.

Art Unit: 2622

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan with Rosen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Regarding claim 14, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches a means for scrolling the scroll bar, and the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image.

Regarding claim 15, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches a means for scrolling the scroll bar, and that the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image. And Sloan further, details that the client sends requests for screen geometry (column 5, lines 29-53) or a particular location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that Sloan would include the ability to scroll the web page image as taught by Rosen.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image web page to that of the underlying larger web page image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan with Rosen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But does not detail the ability to scroll

Art Unit: 2622

within a window. Whereas, Rosen details in fig. 6, #407, and in column 15, lines 12-26, teaches that the scroll bar indicates the relative position and scope of the displayed sub-image to that of the underlying larger image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that the larger window position is fixed as shown in fig. 6, and the smaller window is allowed to be scrolled.

Regarding claim 17, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. Sloan does not explicitly teach receiving a click on a page and the location of the click being detailed back at the server, but does teach a means that a client can send requests for screen geometry (fig. 5, #360, column 5, lines 29-53) or a particular location.

Whereas, Rosen teaches in column 3, lines 16-35, that a cursor controlled by a positioning device which a user uses to navigate the cursor over objects, buttons, menus, scroll bars, etc., which appear on screen and then clicking or in some cases double-clicking in order to activate a screen or task, or to commence an application or some function.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that when a user would click as taught by Rosen within a window, and as taught by Sloan that the application code would send back the information of the location to the server, so that the server would be able to update the data in the open window.

Regarding claim 18, Sloan teaches a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. Sloan does not explicitly detail a web page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes

Art Unit: 2622

a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45, of which includes buttons: back, forward, stop, home, refresh, search, enter or go.

Regarding claim 19, Sloan and Rosen teach a method of manipulating windows with response to requests for a web page from a client terminal to a server. But do not explicitly disclose that there is an image icon that when activated causes a display of a keyboard to be displayed on the display.

Whereas, Deo et al. teaches (column 1, lines 33-42, that the keyboard can be integrated within the display, such as a touch sensitive display. And further, that the display of figure 4, #42, has a hand writing area where a user can input hand written messages, they are stored in memory, and can be recalled by the user and displayed on screen. Further, the device has an alphanumeric character recognition module that when a user writes with the stylus, and character recognition software converts the characters into computer recognizable characters, which can be used by the application programs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that with the ability to recognize hand written characters that it would have been obvious that a icon can be activated and it would bring up a keyboard, thereby allowing the user to input data which would use less computing power than hand written characters.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the keyboard display of Deo with the web page of Sloan and Rosen.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a keyboard icon, which when activated would allow a user a communication interface to input information.

Art Unit: 2622

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan and Rosen with Deo to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Regarding claim 20, Sloan, Rosen and Deo all detail the ability to interface with a web page. Sloan and Deo do not explicitly detail each component of a web page, Deo teaches that the hand held device can subscribe to a wireless carrier and have access to the Internet utilizing a Internet Explorer product (column 4, lines 4-17); and can access a server and the internet through a WAN or LAN as taught in column 9, lines 19-35.

However, Rosen teaches in figure 8, a web page that includes an input area for entering a web address (#60A). Although, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that a web browser such as Internet Explorer includes an address bar.

Regarding claim 21, Sloan, Rosen and Deo teach that the web page application is resident in the device or client terminal. Sloan teaches in column 6, lines 51-66, that the web browser code is stored in the remote user terminal, and Rosen in column 4, lines 4-24, that a terminal includes a processor, operating system, a display, and a HTTP compliant web browser. Deo teaches that the hand held device can subscribe to a wireless carrier and have access to the Internet utilizing a Internet Explorer product (column 4, lines 4-17); and can access a server and the internet through a WAN or LAN as taught in column 9, lines 19-35.

Regarding claim 22, Sloan teaches upon initialization of the HTML page initially downloaded into the remote user terminal from the server comprises decoder code executable by the CPU of the remote user terminal to decode and execute display related x requests forwarded from the server (fig. 6, #380, column 7, lines 8-33). Rosen does not explicitly detail interface image upon initialization. Deo however, teaches that the device includes synchronization, which

Art Unit: 2622

allows the device to synchronize data between a desktop computer or another wireless device (column 4, lines 55-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that upon initialization of the web browser on the device that the server would provide a means to generate a new web page image.

Regarding claim 23, Sloan teaches a machine-readable medium whereby Internet content can be viewed consisting of :

displaying in a first portion of a display (fig. 3, #240, column 4, lines 27-53) of a device a user interface image including a web browser for web browsing (column 5, lines 7-28);

sending a request for a web page from the device to a remote server (fig. 5, #360, column 6, lines 51-66);

receiving at the device from the remote server in a compressed format a web page image (fig. 9, #500, column 8, lines 2-31) the web page image being rendered at the remote server from the entire web page which the remote server retrieves from the Internet in response to a request, and under control of the device (column 8, lines 57-67, and column 9, lines 1-23), selectively displaying a portion of the web page image in a second portion of the display of the device according to a user input to the device while the user interface image is displayed in the first portion of the display.

Sloan does not explicitly detail a web page that has one or more buttons for browsing, whereas Rosen teaches a web page that includes a plurality of buttons used for browsing as seen in fig. 7, and detailed on column 13, lines 32-45.

Further, Sloan does not explicitly detail exclusive control of a web page image, but does teach in column 9, lines 1-23, that the client has means for storing application code (fig. 2, #100)

Art Unit: 2622

and a means (#110) for executing application code to generate output requests, and a means (#120) for communicating the output requests to the server, the terminal having a display screen (fig. 6, #440) and means (#370) for issuing the remote request to the server; the output requests comprising display requests directed to manipulating the display screen and non-display requests which can be processed independently of the terminal or client. And as shown in column 8, lines 2-31, that an image of a web page is generated separate of a web page and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that from the previous information the image can be displayed in a separate display window with its own browsing capabilities as shown by Rosen.

Sloan and Rosen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is how a web page is to be displayed with respect to a server.

At the time the invention of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Sloan web page with the Rosen web page.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to browse within a web page window, which would include buttons for browsing the Internet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sloan with Rosen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

Regarding claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4.

Regarding claim 25, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5.

Regarding claim 26, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6.

Regarding claim 27, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7.

Regarding claim 28, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 8.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 29, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 9.

Regarding claim 30, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 10.

Regarding claim 31, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 11.

Regarding claim 32, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2622

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L Jones whose telephone number is (703) 305-4675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:00am - 3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David L. Jones



EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600